

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 04:30:26 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #156
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 20 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 156

Today's Topics:

 High speed Morse code requirement (6 msgs)
 No-Code Stupidity
 No Code Debate
 Put up or Shut up!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 00:16:09 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!
umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C7AnC0.2Hx@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>What would you suggest? It seems that one minute without any missed
>figures or 70% on a 10 question multi-guess test is not bad, not great, but
>not bad.

The latter is too easy, and doesn't serve the purpose of a "content following"
measure. You can fill in the holes for individual words using the distractors
but not understand what the message is about.

The one minute of perfect copy is sort of a midground between the multi-guess,
and perfect copy of random code groups.

Of course, we could also just use SuperMorse, and measure the rate at which the examinee gets 75% correct in five minutes.

--

=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 00:44:06 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: In article <C7AnC0.2Hx@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.
Todd) writes:
: >What would you suggest? It seems that one minute without any missed
: >figures or 70% on a 10 question multi-guess test is not bad, not great, but
: >not bad.
:
: The latter is too easy, and doesn't serve the purpose of a "content following"
: measure. You can fill in the holes for individual words using the distractors
: but not understand what the message is about.
:
: The one minute of perfect copy is sort of a midground between the multi-guess,
: and perfect copy of random code groups.
:
: Of course, we could also just use SuperMorse, and measure the rate at which
: the examinee gets 75% correct in five minutes.

Boy a typing test too! ick! How about a simulated QSO with the examiner?
Just have the examinee bring in a tape and then if they fail there can be
some form of appeal process. Now that would require copy, comprehension
and sending skills.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 01:58:13 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!dsa@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C7AvDJ.7oE@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
>: Of course, we could also just use SuperMorse, and measure the rate at which
>: the examinee gets 75% correct in five minutes.
>
>Boy a typing test too! ick! How about a simulated QSO with the examiner?
>Just have the examinee bring in a tape and then if they fail there can be
>some form of appeal process. Now that would require copy, comprehension
>and sending skills.

Indeed, this is much the way code tests USED to be. You had to send as well as receive and if you were testing for 20WPM (or for the commercial ops, up to 25 WPM) you could use a "mill" for your copy.

dsa

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 23:55:39 GMT
From: usc!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!
prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <VBREAULT.93May18175328@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com (Val Breault) writes:

>Boy, this is a rather long lived code/nocode debate. They usually
>burn themselves out much sooner than this. I haven't been following
>this thread so I may be restating something that has been said before.
>If I am, then I apologise for taking your time.

This discussion keeps attempting to mutate, that seems to be behind the longevity.

>Arguing and complaining do nothing but divide the amateur radio community.
>I'd like to think that we're above that kind of behavior. Let's get
>on with life and deal with some _real_ issues. Issues like promoting
>amateur radio, increasing the technical level of the operators, sharing

>DF information, making a better cup of coffee....

Well..... keep in mind, Val, that this rec.radio.amateur.policy. A discussion of CW and licensing is perfectly at home here. Getting on with life and discussing making a better cop of coffee probably belongs in alt.drugs.caffeine :-)

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer *
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 06:10:24 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!
othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

:
: Well..... keep in mind, Val, that this rec.radio.amateur.policy. A
: discussion of CW and licensing is perfectly at home here. Getting on
: with life and discussing making a better cop of coffee probably belongs
: in alt.drugs.caffeine :-) ~~~

Want some doughnuts with your COP of coffee Dana? [8->

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 06:14:26 GMT

From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!
othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dsa@netcom.com (David Stine) writes:

: In article <C7AvDJ.7oE@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.
Todd) writes:
: >paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: >: Of course, we could also just use SuperMorse, and measure the rate at which
: >: the examinee gets 75% correct in five minutes.
: >
: >Boy a typing test too! ick! How about a simulated QSO with the examiner?
: >Just have the examinee bring in a tape and then if they fail there can be
: >some form of appeal process. Now that would require copy, comprehension
: >and sending skills.
:
: Indeed, this is much the way code tests USED to be. You had to send as well
: as receive and if you were testing for 20WPM (or for the commercial ops, up
: to 25 WPM) you could use a "mill" for your copy.

"mill"??? I got rid of the old Underwood years ago. About the same time I
had to give up the '47 Spartan TV. :-(big TV+ little apartment= new TV.
How about my TRS-80 model 100 it's not quite a '47 but it is even older
than my Toshiba T1000. I love antiques!

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 22:52:19 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <JeBR4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)

writes:

>

>Tom, is there some reason why no-code technicians cannot simply be HAPPY
>with the class of license they earned, rather than constantly bitching
>about how unfair the system is?

Hmmmm.... Robert, this thread has not been Technicians complaining about the unfair system. Rather, as far as I can tell, it has been people suggesting that the current licensing requirements may not be sensible with respect to CW. I don't recall any Technician posting a whine about the unfair system.

My point is that CW is no longer as important to achieving the goals of the Amateur Radio Service as it was when the Amateur Radio Service was established. I've been suggesting that CW be de-emphasized in the licensing procedure. I've suggested that alternatives be provided to the 13 and 20 WPM tests, such as specialized written exams which verify an amateur has developed some skill past the norm. I've refuted claims that the current CW requirements "keep the riff-raff out".

So, what is so obnoxious about this?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 22:58:17 GMT

From: csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: No Code Debate

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May18.205659.27800@oz.plymouth.edu> r_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu
(Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

>In article <C78nu2.HGv@news.iastate.edu> njohnson@sysad.cnde.iastate.edu (Neil
Johnson) writes:

>>

>>Even if the code-requirement is no-longer required for HF priveleges, I will
still

>>take pride in having put the effort into learning Morse code.

>>

>

> NOW this guy has a good attitude about the whole thing. Too bad

>the other no-code techs don't take after this gentleman's example
>

Statistics show that 60% of Technician licensees upgrade to coded privileges.
Most Technicians *do* learn code, whether they need to or not.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Wed, 19 May 1993 23:50:52 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

[Todd's fill in the blank stuff deleted, for now]

:
: The next thing I'd like to see is consolidating elements 1A - 1C with the
: written elements as proposed by Gary Coffman. Along with this, an
: increasing emphasis on the digital modes.

:

Gary,

Care to elaborate? No kerosene please! :-)

Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #156
